

1961

By Mr. GOLDWATER:
Editorial entitled "Hypocrisy on the Schools," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 19, 1961.

By Mr. MUNDT:
Editorial entitled "Gagarin and God," published in the Hairenik (Mass.) Weekly.

By Mr. WILEY:
Article entitled "World Food Budget Favors West," written by Loren H. Osman and published in the Milwaukee Journal on May 21, 1961.

Two resolutions, adopted by the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO Conference on Apprenticeship.

By Mr. HARTKE:
Article entitled "Educators Sound Off for HARTKE," written by Walter Spencer and published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Times of May 21, 1961, dealing with the recommendation of the Indiana Academic Advisory Council, for the enactment of a civilian GI bill to retrain workers displaced by automation.

By Mr. JAVITS:
Eight essays relating to the subject "What a Career Will Mean to Me."

CUBA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the atmosphere in Washington, both inside and outside this Chamber, has recently been full of sound, fury, and oratory with respect to our policy toward Cuba. At the moment we are engaged in loud talk about the desirability of entering into an arrangement with the Cuban dictator for the exchange of prisoners for tractors. I suggest that in recent days more heat than light has been cast on that subject.

This morning, there appears in the Washington Post an editorial entitled "Blood Bargaining," which stresses the importance of making every effort in a calm and dispassionate way to set the record clear in regard to the nature of the proposed bargain. The editorial suggests that hot words would play into Castro's hands, in an argument which this country could not win.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOOD BARGAINING

Let no one underestimate Fidel Castro's craft in exacting every last drop of advantage in a propaganda battle. Since Castro's original offer to "exchange" prisoners for tractors put his regime in an ugly light, he now denounces us for using his terminology and insists that the tractors are simply an "indemnification."

But the fact is that this country has some responsibility for the lives of the 1,200 luckless invaders now in Castro's hands. If they were to be executed—as Castro darkly hints—it might blacken the Cuban regime's reputation, but at a price far too cruel to pay. It is necessary to swallow a little pride in the hope that lives may be saved, and that the ultimate moral victory will go to those who value men more than machines.

Eleanor Roosevelt, Milton Eisenhower, and Walter Reuther have undertaken a humanitarian task in raising funds for the unhappy transaction. It would be a fine gesture if leaders all through the Western Hemisphere were to unite in the effort. The world ought to know that this is a matter that transcends government and reaches directly to the people themselves.

Every effort ought to be made, in a calm and dispassionate way, to set the record clear as to the nature of the bargain. But hot words would play into Castro's hand in an argument which this country could not win.

Mr. CLARK. This business about the tractors and the prisoners is, to my way of thinking, only a digression with respect to the important debate on our Cuban policy. It occurs to me that in this debate far too little attention has been paid to the necessity for the United States to keep its international obligations and far too little attention has been paid to the importance of having the United States keep its treaties and observe the rule of law. We talk about the importance of the rule of law; but we tend to ignore it when it is not to our advantage.

In the May 13 issue of the Saturday Review, there was published a guest editorial entitled "The Cuba Incident and the Rule of Law." The author of the editorial is an able Republican, Mr. Arthur Larson, who served with distinction for President Eisenhower in various capacities during the late administration. The editorial points out that the Cuba incident which resulted in disaster was a clear violation, insofar as the United States was concerned, of both our international commitments and our domestic criminal statutes which prohibit in no uncertain terms what we very clearly did.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CUBA INCIDENT AND THE RULE OF LAW (By Arthur Larson)

In the first detailed expose of what went on behind closed doors before the decision on the Cuban enterprise was made, Wallace Carroll recounted in more than three full New York Times columns the many elements that were discussed and weighed: the intelligence estimates, the chances of success, the possible effect on American prestige, the matter of timing, and so on. At almost the end of the article, after a reference to the recruiting, training, and financing of invasion troops in the United States, there followed this sentence: "Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Abram J. Chayes, State Department's legal adviser, checked the laws covering such activities and raised questions about their legality." This is one of the very few references to law to be found in the millions of words that have been written about the Cuban incident.

Now that the enterprise has miscarried, the reaction of the American people, official and unofficial, follows the same pattern: the timing was bad; the intelligence work was bad; the failure to do an all-out job was bad; the effect on American prestige was bad. It is time someone said plainly—and not just as an incidental afterthought—that the whole affair was a flagrant violation of law.

Take a look at the Federal criminal statute quoted on this page, and at the passage from Habana Treaty—which under article VI of our Constitution is, with the Constitution and statutes, the "supreme law of the land." Then recall that only a few weeks ago we were watching on television the marching drills of recruits and the activities of enlistment centers, and reading in our papers illustrated accounts of the open recruiting, fi-

ancing, and training of these forces in several centers on the soil of the United States. I do not presume to discuss alleged active aid by governmental agencies; mere governmental tolerance of such activities on our soil is illegal in itself; affirmative governmental participation would sharply increase the gravity of the offense.

What has gone wrong in this land that prides itself on being the guardian of the rule of law?

Are these laws out of date? No. There are 10 pages of notes of decided cases following the statute first cited. The noninterference principle stated in the other quotations on this page has been restated in a number of subsequent treaties and declarations made by the American republics, including the Bogotá and Caracas actions designed to provide, through the Organization of American States, procedures for this very problem. The same principle has been applied by actions of the General Assembly to actual cases, such as the actions in 1948 and 1949 condemning aid by Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to Greek guerillas.

Are these laws more legal technicalities? They are not. We are not dealing here with the fringes of international law and conduct. This is the very heart of the matter: the integrity of national states; the right of freedom from interference in domestic affairs; the illegality of force in international relations.

Are we justified in our conduct because of a threat to our security? There are five ways in which our security could be threatened:

1. By a direct aggressive assault by Castro upon the United States. No responsible person seriously believes that this is a genuine danger. In any real showdown, one wave of planes from the aircraft carrier *Saratoga* could destroy Cuba in a matter of minutes.

2. By subversive activities aimed at the United States. We have been dealing with such activities for years by much bigger and more expert practitioners.

3. By direct aggressive assault by Castro upon other Latin American countries. In such an event, force can be met with force with complete legality under the United Nations Charter. Collective measures under the Bogotá Pack and the Caracas Declaration would be in order, and our assistance would earn us the support rather than the fears of our Latin American neighbors.

4. By subversive activities aimed at Latin American countries. These countries have been dealing with subversive plots throughout their history under their own laws. Here again, we can give our help by operating through the channels of the OAS, the U.N., and the various treaties and declarations aimed at collective action against such subversion.

5. By the gradual rise of pro-Castro, pro-Communist, anti-American sentiment throughout Latin America. This is the real threat, the new threat. The surest way to exacerbate this threat is to become committed to a policy of "bringing down Castro" quickly by whatever amount of American intervention is necessary. We must not forget that throughout Latin American history the spectre of interventionism has always taken the form of the fear of Yankee interventionism. The fear of Communist interventionism is only a few years old. The older fear runs very deep, and lies just under the surface. If we begin to act too imperiously and unilaterally, this fear could easily become once more the main force of Latin American politics, and could overwhelm the competing new force of anti-communism and anti-Castroism. On the other hand, the surest way to defeat this threat and enhance our security is to press forward vigorously with constructive pro-

May 24

grams of economic development, to attune our policies and direct our attention to the lively and discontented new elements in these countries—the students, intellectuals, and young professional people who hold the key to the future and who should be our strongest allies, to insist at every point on strengthening and utilizing the OAS and other agreed collective measures, and above all to make respect for the national integrity of our neighbors the main theme of our policy.

Finally, there is the tu quoque argument, perhaps the commonest of all. The Communists do it; therefore we not only may do it but must do it. If we ever succumb to that poisonous doctrine we are finished. It would be a poor sort of victory to become, in the process of winning, the very thing we are struggling against. We have our own objectives, and our own methods of reaching them. We seek—in company with most people everywhere, including those of Latin America—a world that orders its affairs and settles its disputes under law, that respects the self-determination of nations, and that bans resort to force and subversion whether by friend or enemy.

We have been admonished to learn some "useful lessons" from the Cuban experience. Perhaps the most useful lesson is this: We do not get rid of violence by emulating violence. We do not build a world of law by flouting law when it gets in the way of our sympathies, no matter how strong and well founded those sympathies may be. The way to build the world we want, in short, is to be ourselves.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to the importance of keeping a clear head in connection with our Cuba policy, the importance of cooperating with our Latin American neighbors, and the importance of not giving the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists an opportunity to charge us with being treaty violators and violators of our own statutes who fail to comply with the rule of law for ourselves, while we piously demand that others keep their treaty obligations.

LACK OF ATTRACTIVENESS OF TEACHING AS A PROFESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning I read in the Washington Post an article entitled "Ten Straight A High School Seniors Admit They're a Little Bit Dizzy." The article refers to 10 seniors at the Arlington, Va., Wakefield High School, who yesterday were honored in ceremonies at the school.

I wish to read one paragraph of the article, because it relates to the bill we debating and on which we are going to take affirmative action:

Only one girl, Barbara Anderson, plans to study education and to become a teacher. Three other girls—Alice Mattice, Stephanie Duke and Janice Niblett—said they had considered teaching, but were dissuaded because of salaries. Several boys said flatly they didn't think they could live on teacher pay.

Mr. President, these ten students are the top students in one of the finest high schools in this metropolitan area; and of the ten, only one says she plans to be a teacher. Three of the other young women have been dissuaded from becoming teachers because of the low salaries and the poor economic condi-

tions; and all the boys in the group say they could not live on a teacher's salary.

I believe this article points up the issue we now face in connection with Federal aid to education. I happened to notice the article as I was coming to the capitol, this morning; and if ever there was a cogent argument in favor of providing more help to education, it is the article to which I have just referred.

THE CAPITOL TERRACES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every once in a while one notices in the morning press something which attracts his attention.

I have noticed, around the Capitol, the beautiful terraces. The majority leader saw to it that the grounds around the Capitol were at least brought back to reasonable shape, so they will be attractive.

However, around the Capitol are beautiful terraces which are unused. Apparently we lack some of the appreciation of beauty which is so widely developed among other peoples. Can we imagine that a Parisian would permit these beautiful terraces to be unused? Here they are; but on them one does not find even a bench, a table, or a chair. In fact, these beautiful terraces around the Capitol could well be use for what some of our colleagues have been talking about—namely, sidewalk cafes. It is very difficult for tourists to find in and around the Capitol adequate places where they can eat and rest; but right here, on both sides of the Capitol, around the Senate wing and the House wing, are very beautiful terraces which, with but little change in terms of their covering, could be made most useful, with the addition of tables, benches, canopies, umbrellas, and with the provision of some good service, which I believe we might be able to provide by means of a catering service. Thus, in addition to having the pleasure of outdoor recreation and outdoor eating, we could also make available to the citizenry who pay for this Capitol an opportunity to have a very satisfying and beautiful experience.

Mr. President, I believe that the two items I have submitted this morning—one in regard to the situation in the field of education, and the other in regard to the need to develop beauty around the Capitol—help to begin our day fairly well.

RANSOM OF CUBAN HOSTAGES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to briefly comment on the activities of the volunteer committee, headed by Milton Eisenhower, Walter Reuther, and Mrs. Roosevelt, which is trying to raise \$15 million to provide 500 tractors as a ransom for the Cuban freedom fighters.

I believe that our Government should call an immediate halt to the activities of this committee and remind its leaders that we have an administration and a Congress for the making of foreign policy and for deciding whether or not the American people will pay tribute to the Cuban Communist dictator.

There are two fundamental questions involved here:

First, shall we submit to blackmail by the Communists?

Second, shall we permit volunteer groups of private citizens to meddle in delicate matters of foreign policy?

On the first point, I believe that the American people must, as a matter of principle, oppose the paying of tribute to Castro or anyone else, however laudable its immediate aim may be.

There are 1 billion hostages in the Communist prison house of nations. We ought to be thinking about them every day of our lives. We ought to be formulating our policies and shaping our programs to bring about their eventual freedom. Our failure to pursue such policies cannot be redeemed by an impetuous, sentimental, token response to one aspect of a vast problem.

For many years, I have been concerned with the problem of John Downey, a young man from New Britain, Conn., who has been imprisoned by the Chinese Communists throughout that period. There have been many others, including that saintly American, Bishop James E. Walsh, who have been thrown into Communist prisons, and there is today a large number of American citizens in Castro's jails.

We must be concerned with all of these tragic cases, but our concern must be expressed not in the easy payment of a tyrant's ransom, but in the dearer coinage of national policies that will put these tyrants out of business and begin to redeem the freedom of all men.

Our national concern for the plight of the Cubans and for the safety of the Cuban freedom fighters should have been evidenced by effective help on the beachhead to enable their just revolution to succeed. Having failed that test, we are now asked to render ourselves absurd and ridiculous by crawling to Castro and by making of our country the foil for his propaganda efforts.

By paying Castro's price for a thousand good men, we only give him the means to strengthen his enslavement of 6 million others.

More regrettably, if this voluntary committee is permitted to carry out its plan, the American people will, for the first time to my knowledge, be making use of ransom and tribute as an instrument of policy. If we start to pay tribute now for 1,000 of the 1 billion Communist hostages, where will it stop?

For many years the United States has tolerated the spectacle of Cyrus Eaton and others parading around the world engaging in discussions with Communist leaders, to the embarrassment and detriment of the United States. We have endured other troublesome harassments, such as the refusal of longshoremen, for their own political reasons, to unload this or that foreign ship, thus creating international incidents.

The Reuther-Roosevelt-Milton Eisenhower committee again poses the problem, and I think the time has come for us to face up to it.

Private citizens and private groups must not be allowed to interfere with the conduct of our international affairs. The

attempt of private citizens to pay a foreign dictator for the release of foreign nationals captured during an insurrection is so clear a case of interference in the lawful jurisdiction of our Government that it simply cannot be tolerated.

This is irresponsible meddling, and this fact cannot be altered by the humanitarian aims of the enterprise.

If this committee is not in violation of the letter of the Logan Act, it is surely in violation of its spirit, and I believe this incident should furnish the impetus to Congress for the drafting of a new Logan Act, an act equal to the task of controlling the activities of a rash of self-appointed emissaries without portfolio.

The situation is further complicated by reports today that the Internal Revenue Service may grant tax deductions to those who contribute to the ransom fund. This can only have the effect of furnishing a semblance of official sanction to the committee. If the U.S. Government wants to submit to blackmail by Fidel Castro, let it try to do so through official channels, where it will be promptly and properly repudiated by the Congress and the people.

I feel quite certain the U.S. Government is not a silent partner in this endeavor, but the situation is by now so confused that I feel it is mandatory for the State Department to issue a statement repudiating the efforts of the ransom committee and calling for a halt to its activities.

DETENTION OF MOISE TSHOMBE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, earlier in the month I expressed my disapproval of the seizure of Moise Tshombe, one of the leaders of the Congo, while he was attending a peace conference under a pledge of safe conduct. There have been hints, particularly from United Nations sources, that this seizure might be used to compel Kasavubu and Tshombe to make some agreement with respect to the future of that unhappy state, the Congo; but, without regard to the attempts to justify it, any man with a sense of fairplay will denounce this arrest, while Tshombe was traveling under the white flag, as a most reprehensible act.

I have expressed my great disappointment that the United Nations, which protested so loudly at the assassination of Patrice Lumumba, has not likewise protested this illegal and immoral act of seizing Tshombe while he was under the white flag.

As I have stated before, I have been amazed that there has been so little interest generated by this dastardly act. The United Nations passed a resolution condemning the murder of Lumumba, and properly so, but they apparently have taken no serious steps to try to secure the release of Tshombe. Both Tshombe and Lumumba had been critical of the United Nations, so we must look further to find the reason for the difference in approach by officials of the United Nations.

I have two editorials that I wish to have printed in the Record as a part of

my remarks. Both of these editorials, one in the New York Times and the other in the Savannah Morning News, ask the question, What would have happened if Premier Gizenga, successor of Lumumba, had been seized under similar conditions? Both point out there would have been demonstrations in every capital of the world. When the Communists demonstrated, the United Nations condemned. Tshombe has been strongly anticommunistic and is therefore expendable.

This double standard of morality, if persisted in by the United Nations, will destroy the usefulness of that body in settling disputes at the conference table, and we are likely to have a great many which should be settled at the conference table before the birth pains of the emerging new nations are ended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of the editorials to which I have referred be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1961]

TREACHEROUS ACT

When Moise Tshombe, leader of Katanga, traveled to Coquilhatville last month to confer with Leopoldville officials on the Congo's future status, he came as the leader of the richest, most independent province in the divided African state. Now, in one of those fantastic developments that we have to expect in the Congo, he stands under arrest and accused of high treason.

Mr. Tshombe, who has adamantly refused to cooperate with the U.N. or other Congo leaders, should nevertheless have been able to count on the immunities covering any participant in a political conference. His abrupt seizure by Leopoldville officials who are dissatisfied with his bargaining attitude was a treacherous act which the unpopularity of Mr. Tshombe outside Katanga in no way excuses.

The United Nations has asked President Kasavubu to adhere to the principles of "fair treatment and due process of law" with regard to Mr. Tshombe. One can imagine what an uproar would have been created in many quarters if Premier Gizenga of secessionist Stanleyville had been similarly seized. The United Nations has the duty to insist on Tshombe's release, remembering that the principles of "fair treatment and due process" apply to those with few outside friends as well as to those with many.

[From the Savannah Morning News, May 11, 1961]

WHERE ARE THE DEMONSTRATIONS?

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL took the floor of the Senate this week to attack the detention of Moise Tshombe, doughty boss of the Congo's Katanga Province.

Tshombe may be so guilty of crimes that the United Nations should arrest him, Senator RUSSELL declared, but his seizure at the Congo political conference constitutes breach of a promise of safe conduct.

Few other voices have been raised to protect the seizure of Tshombe, even though he faces possible execution. This seems strange in view of the uproar raised when Patrice Lumumba underwent the same experience.

Where are the demonstrators now? Why aren't mobs in cities around the globe astir? Why doesn't the Soviet Union protest? Why are all the neutrals silent? Isn't Tshombe as much a victim as Patrice Lumumba?

The arrest of Moise Tshombe is but another chapter in the Congo's brutal political struggle. Its participants recognize no rules, and Americans are at a loss when they seek to judge the actions of the Congolese by accepted standards.

It was at the hands of Moise Tshombe, it has been charged, that Patrice Lumumba met his death. This is the grave accusation lodged against the Katanga leader. The charge of "treason" which has been leveled against him means only that he does not agree with his captors.

So why no demonstrations in defense of Moise Tshombe? The cases are almost the same, except that Tshombe's record is perhaps a bit the cleaner, ugly though it may be.

Could it be that the difference lies in their attitude toward communism? Whatever else Moise Tshombe may be, he is not pro-Communist. Patrice Lumumba was.

It doesn't take involved reasoning to draw a deduction from that. The Communists aren't concerned about Moise Tshombe's fate, so there are no demonstrations. But what if the prisoner held by the central government happened to be Antoine Gizenga, the pro-Red successor to Patrice Lumumba? Would there be silence then? There would not.

PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of these brief remarks, I shall send to the desk a concurrent resolution on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself and ask for its immediate consideration.

I have advised those Senators who I thought might have an interest in this concurrent resolution to be in the Chamber this morning, and I am hopeful they are.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution which I shall send to the desk in a few minutes concerns itself with the situation of the President of the United States in respect of Alabama, where he has been compelled by circumstances in that State to take action of the highest order, in terms of the executive power, in sending a large number of U.S. marshals into that State in order to protect the rights of citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, this is a pretty serious situation, and it is time that the attention of the whole country be called to it most markedly. Interstate bus segregation is an evil—that is a word, incidentally, used by the New York Times—and in illegal tradition. U.S. citizens have a legal right to unsegregated bus transportation and to be carried physically in buses from one State to another.

The State authorities cannot be excused from failure to protect citizens in their rights, not only as citizens of their States, but as citizens of the United States.

We have had the spectacle of a personal representative of the United States, Mr. Seigenthaler, of the Department of Justice, lying on the streets of a city in Alabama unconscious, as a result of mob action.

Mr. President, I am a lawyer. There are many lawyers in the Senate. Provocation is no defense to a charge of committing serious crime. All the talk about provocation omits the cardinal

May 24

fact that the people allegedly provoking are engaged in perfectly legal acts, while they who react with violence are engaged in entirely illegal acts.

Mr. President, the President of the United States took the only action he could take, in view of the law and the Constitution and the failure or refusal of State officials to act. On that score we are left in no doubt. The Attorney General of the United States, in a communication sent to me, and I assume sent to most other Senators, said, in respect to the Governor of the State of Alabama:

Therefore, although I strongly believe that law enforcement matters should be handled by local authorities whenever possible, now not being even able to reach you to learn what steps you intend to take, we have no alternative but to order the following action—

And he then specifies the action.

As reported in this morning's newspapers, the Attorney General has sent a reply to members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives from Alabama in which he says practically the same thing; that he did his utmost to get action from the State authorities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. President, the President should have asked Congress for legislation on civil rights. I have been very ardent in that cause. But for this situation the President needs no legislation. He is entitled to know that the country is with him.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I now submit, for myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for which I ask immediate consideration, is an effort to inform the President that the country is with him in the making of this very serious decision.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I object to consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may the concurrent resolution be stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States be supported in measures to enforce the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted thereunder for the protection of individual rights, in such States where citizens of the United States may be deprived of their rights under the Constitution and such laws, or jeopardized in the enjoyment thereof, by virtue of the actions of citizens of any State, or by virtue of the actions or failures to act of the public authorities charged with the enforcement of the laws in such State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say a few words about this matter.

No one has been more saddened by the tragic occurrences of the last several days in the South than the Senator from Georgia. I have deplored all the acts of violence, not only because they were against the law, but also because they ran counter to the best interests of the people of the South—and I refer now to the white people of the South—whose interests have been at stake in the legislative battles we have waged on this floor.

Mr. President, the people of Alabama made a mistake when they permitted themselves to be provoked into violence. The so-called freedom riders, I understand, had no difficulty anywhere they traveled until they did associate young white girls with Negro males, and that did bring forth these lawless acts. I deplore every one of them even though I realize the extent of the provocation. But it should have been recognized that the CORE organization was determined to provoke violence and then demand the intervention of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, while coming to the Senate this morning, I happened to hear on the radio that a man named Rockwell, I believe, had invaded the city of New Orleans with a group of Nazis. Frankly, I did not know we had any Nazis in this country at this time.

It was not charged that this group had committed any illegal acts, but it was stated on this morning's radio news that the police force of New Orleans, at the instruction of the governing body there, had stopped the bus and compelled the occupants to cover up all the incendiary signs which were attached to the bus before they were permitted to proceed.

Mr. President, we do not want to have any double standard of political morality. We should consider the resolution, to determine if it would not be appropriate to affix an amendment which would commend and congratulate the mayor of New Orleans and the authorities of that city generally for their handling of the Rockwell incident and in any other cases where the governing authorities have enforced the peace.

Of course, it is a rather absurd position for the Senate to undertake to commend the President of the United States for undertaking to enforce what he regards as the law. That is his duty. That is what he is sworn to do.

I should like to consider other aspects of this concurrent resolution, so I therefore object to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The concurrent resolution will be received and will go over 1 day, under the rule.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was ordered to lie over 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD sundry articles and other data from which I have read with respect to the resolution.

There being no objection, the letter, telegram, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1961.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of the telegram which I sent to Governor Patterson of Alabama on Saturday, May 20, informing him of the reasons why it was necessary to send U.S. deputy marshals to Montgomery to maintain peace and order and protect interstate travel and commerce.

The action was taken pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 333, which provides that—

"The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination * * *."

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
May 20, 1961.

Gov. JOHN PATTERSON,
Montgomery, Ala.:

As you know, since early this last week I have been deeply concerned about the situation in Alabama. From my conversation with you on Monday and numerous conversations that I and my associates here had with your aids, you have been aware of the concern with which we have regarded this very explosive situation. Since the destruction of the bus on Sunday and the interference of interstate travel you have been made aware of our clear responsibility in this area. The President himself when he was unable to reach you Friday made this clear to the Lieutenant Governor and pointed out that the Federal Government has the responsibility to guarantee safe passage in interstate commerce and that free travel had not been possible for 5 days in Alabama. The President hoped that the government of Alabama would restore the situation without the need for action by Federal authorities.

You then requested that the President send a personal representative to discuss the matter with you. As you know, Mr. Seigenthaler of this office met with you last evening and in your presence talked to me on the telephone. He told me that you wanted to assure the President and the Federal Government that you had the will, the force, the men, and the equipment to fully protect everyone in Alabama.

Mr. Seigenthaler assured you that the Federal Government was willing to provide marshals and any other assistance in order to assure that interstate commerce was unimpeded. You stated that this was unnecessary and that you and the local authorities would be completely able to handle every contingency. You suggested that we notify the Greyhound Bus Co. that this guarantee had been given. It was based on this assurance of safe conduct that the students boarded the bus in Birmingham on their trip to Montgomery. These students boarded the bus this morning. They arrived in Montgomery and were attacked and beaten by a mob. Prior to their arrival we took the additional precautionary step of having the FBI notify the police department that these students were coming and asked the police to take all necessary steps for their protection. The FBI was informed and in turn notified us that all necessary steps had been taken and that no action on our part was necessary. As a matter of fact, no police were present. However, an armed mob was. Several of the travelers were severely beaten. The President's personal representative, Mr. Seigen-